DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 516 JC 790 508

TITLE A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Alternative Learning Experiences at Whatcom Community College, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION Whatcom Community Coll., Bellingham, Wash.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Correspondence Courses; Counseling; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Finance; Expenditures; *Junior Colleges; Nontraditional Students; On the Job Training; Performance Based Education; *Performance Contracts; *Program Costs; Program Evaluation; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The Alternative Learning Experiences (ALE) Program at Whatcom Community College was designed to provide opportunities for students to pursue educational goals outside the traditional classroom, specifically through the use of learning contracts, advising services, on-the-job training programs, correspondence courses, and competency-based vocational programs. In order to determine the relationship between the outcomes of ALE and the costs of the program, a study was designed which examined course descriptions and activities, student characteristics, student and faculty evaluations, and ALE budget expenditures. During fall 1978, 125 students were engaged in instructional activity; 70% were involved in individual learning contracts accounting for 33% of the effort of the 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty in the program. Both faculty and student evaluations indicated that the contracts were valuable and relevant; 88% of the students completed the contracts they initiated in the program. Costs of the ALE program for fall 1978 totaled $13,457. Cost per FTE student was $330.63, a relatively low cost for the type and variety of services provided. Appendices to this report focus on student characteristics, sample learning contracts, interview guides, student and faculty evaluation forms, and the procedure used to calculate FTE and program costs. (DR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175516

A COST-EFFECTIVENESS STUDY OF ALTERNATIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES AT WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1978 - 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Whatcom Community College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 608

Office of Research Evaluation Planning
Whatcom Community College
5217 Northwest Road
Bellingham, WA 98225
(206) 676-2170, 384-1541

A COST EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

OF

ALTERNATIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES

AT

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . . . . . Page 1

STUDY DESIGN . . . . . " 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . . " 4

- Program Activities . . . . . " 4
- Student Characteristics . . . . . " 5
- Student Interviews . . . . . " 6
- Student Evaluation . . . . . " 7
- Faculty Evaluation . . . . . " 9
- Program Costs . . . . . " 11

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . " 14

APPENDIX A - Student Characteristics . . . . . " 15

APPENDIX B - Student Interviews . . . . . " 16

APPENDIX C - Student Evaluation . . . . . " 21

APPENDIX D - Faculty Evaluation . . . . . " 27

APPENDIX E - FTE'S Cost Calculation . . . . . " 32

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 . . . . . Page 8

FIGURE 2 . . . . . Page 12

INTRODUCTION

Chapter five within the Master Plan for Whatcom Community College communicates the desire to deliver educational programs and services to people throughout the district "..at times, locations and ways that will meet the wide range of individual and community needs...".*

One of the mid-range goal statements within chapter five is:

> "To increase the use of various instructional modes of delivery for both day and evening programs."

The Alternative Learning Experiences (ALE) Program is specifically designed to address that goal. The program provides those types of study and learning which are generally referred to as "non-traditional" or "alternative" within higher education. Mechanisms are established which suit individual needs primarily by offering a variety of delivery methods and procedures for assisting the student to meet his/her educational objectives. The priority of ALE is to provide services to the learner rather than course credit or degree programs. Emphasis is on flexibility, variable time options, achievement of competencies and use of college and community resource persons.

The goals and objectives of the Alternative Learning Experience Programs are:

1. To provide opportunities for students to pursue their educational interests and goals outside the traditional classroom in vocational, academic transfer, general education and general interest areas, except for scheduled developmental center courses.
   - A. The student will be able to have his/her education individualized through the development of learning contracts in all possible subject areas.
   - B. The student will be able to learn on his/her own in preparation for CLEP exams through an up-dated reading list of appropriate library resources.

*Master Plan. Chapter Five Summary, page 15

C. The student will be able to be advised and arrangements made for volunteer placements in the community that are educational in their duties.

D. The student will be provided cooperative-education on-the-job training in vocational fields that are appropriate to his/her training.

E. The student will be able to take business and industry related correspondence courses designed to prepare for and up-grade in vocational areas.

F. The student will be able to have individual competency-based vocational programs designed and for which certificates or degrees are granted.

2. To provide means for students to have their non-college learning evaluated for college credit.

A. The student will be able to follow a consistent process to challenge WCC courses for credit, contingent upon instructor approval.

1. The student will be able to take general and subject exams through The College Level Exam Program (CLEP) at WCC which will be evaluated and transcripted as college courses and credits.

2. The student will have the opportunity to be advised on the availability and policy towards national standardized tests such as ACT, CEEB, WAshington Pre-College, Modern Language Association tests, Professional Secretary Examination.

3. The student will be able to receive college credits through the development of a portfolio that describes and documents prior experiential learning.

4. The student will be able to have military training and experience evaluated for college credit and transcripted in a manner that maximizes transferability.

3. To provide staff development to faculty and administrators in order to improve their understanding and skills in working with various aspects of the Alternative Learning Program.

Students may earn up to 90 credits through the variety of learning opportunities in the Alternative Learning Experiences Program. The credits may be applied

toward requirements in a degree program or may be considered elective credit. Awards of credit are made in terms of and consistent with the regular curricular offerings of the College or assigned a department and given as special projects number 189 or 289 (eg. Eng. 189).

STUDY DESIGN

The cost-effectiveness study for the Alternative Learning Experiences Program focused upon the relationship of ALE outcomes and costs. The design provided for the acquisition of data from several sources to establish a context in which to determine that relationship. These sources were:

1. ALE activities - events which transpired Fall Quarter were documented and described.
2. Student Characteristics - basic demographic information was obtained on students involved in ALE Fall Quarter, 1978, to identify the kinds of students being served in the program.
3. Student Evaluations - students working on learning contracts were asked to assess the quality of their experiences.
4. Faculty Evaluations - faculty serving as resource people, working with students on learning contracts, were asked to assess the quality of the activities in which they were involved.
5. ALE Program Costs - budget expenditures were examined and costs to support the program were calculated for Fall Quarter.

Analysis of the data acquired from these various sources provided a description of the students and the activities they undertook, an assessment of the quality of the activities in which they were engaged and the associated costs of the program.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Program Activities

During Fall Quarter, 1978, one and one-half full-time equivalent faculty were assigned to the Alternative Learning Experiences Programs. Within that time period 40.7 FTE'S* were generated through a variety of educational activities:

1. Eighty-eight individual learning contracts were written for students. Seventy-seven of the learning contracts were completed by the end of Winter Quarter, 1979.
2. Eight multi-occupational programs were designed for eight students. Three were initiated Fall Quarter, 1978.
3. Eight students were assisted in assessing their prior experiential learning and developing portfolios for college credit.

*Full-time equivalent students

4. Six students were assisted in registering for correspondence courses and receiving college credit for their work.
5. Three course challenges were processed.
6. One student was assisted in taking a course at another institution and receiving credit for it from Whatcom.
7. Twenty-four students were assisted in organizing their Lummi School of Acquaculture and Fisheries (LISAF) courses into an Associate Degree Program through Whatcom.
8. A cooperative-Education Program was designed and a grant proposal written and submitted to fund it.
9. Students were advised and referred to other college programs or institutions.

Of the above activities, development of individual learning contracts represented thirty-three percent of staff effort. LISAF Associate Degree Program Development represented eighteen percent. Assessment of prior learning represented thirteen percent effort and cooperative education represented nine percent effort. Each of the other activities represented smaller percentages of staff effort. In addition to the activities previously mentioned, staff were engaged in in-service training and administration of the program.

During Fall Quarter, 1978, one hundred students were directly served by ALE staff and were enrolled in various instructional activities. It was estimated by ALE staff that between 20 to 30 additional students were advised and referred to other programs or institutions.

Student Characteristics

Demographic data was obtained on a sample of fifty-five students enrolled in the ALE program Fall Quarter, 1978. This sample group represented students working on learning contracts during that period and those enrolled in Education 120, Prior Experiential Learning Evaluation. Students enrolled in only these two activities were used because both activities are continually offered and therefore present a more representative description of students engaged with the ALE program.

Of the fifty-five students 28 (52%) were females. The average age of the group was 31.73 years with fifty percent of the individuals falling within the 26-35 age bracket. Twenty-nine percent were in the 18-25 age group. One individual was 82.

The majority (66%) of the students resided in the Bellingham area. A small percentage lived in Ferndale (9%), Lynden (7%) and Blaine (5%). The remainder of the groups residences were widely dispersed: two were from Lummi Island, one from Custer, one from Mt. Vernon, one from Sedro Woolley and one from Seattle.

Student educational intent for the group was primarily college transfer/AA degree (Intent B) or vocational/occupational degree or certificate (Intent F).

Fifty percent (28 students) indicated an educational intent of "B" and nineteen percent (11 students) indicated intent "F". Thirteen percent (6 students) of the group were in the intent "J" category (specialized training related to current job). Nine percent (5 students) indicated intent "L" (non-degree, non-certificate). "Adult Basic Education" and "GED" were the educational intents of two of the remaining individuals. The other two individuals were undecided as to their educational intent.

The number of credits earned by individuals within the group ranged from zero to 110 with the average being 33.65. Seventy-three percent of the group (41 students) had earned credits amounting to less than forty-five, the amount equivalent to one year of college attendance. Thirty percent (17 students) had fifteen or less credits with three individuals having none at all. Another thirty percent (17 students) had earned between sixteen and thirty credits. Six individuals had earned more than ninety credits (the amount equivalent to two years of college).

The grade point averages (GPA) of students within the group tended to be high. Thirty-eight percent (19 students) had GPA's above 3.50 (on a four point scale). Five individuals had GPA's of 4.00. Thirty-two percent (16 students) of the group had GPA's from 3.00 to 3.49. Considering these two groups, seventy percent of the students had GPA's of 3.00 or better. The average GPA for the group was 3.20 with a range of 2.00 to 4.00. Appendix A summarizes all of the student characteristics previously discussed.

Student Interviews

During Winter Quarter,1979 a group of twenty-two students was randomly selected and interviewed when they made initial contact with ALE staff. The intent of the interviews was to gather additional information about students engaging with the ALE program, specifically their previous educational history and experience in alternative education.

Administration of the interview process did not occur as planned. ALE staff had difficulty using the interview guide developed for the interviews and in many instances, due to the individual's need for advisement, they attempted to complete the guide after the session was concluded. Consequently, data on many students was incomplete.

Data obtained from the student interviews did indicate the following:

1. Nineteen of the twenty-two students had previously attended Whatcom. Eight since Fall Quarter, 1978. The majority within the last two years.
2. Most of the students had clear educational goals. Ten of the students were in degree programs. Three were not enrolled in any degree program.
3. The learning contracts desired by the students were related to their educational goals and their degree programs.
4. Sixteen students had developed and completed a learning contract previously at Whatcom.
5. The primary reason given for wanting to develop a learning contract was "unavailability of instruction."
6. Only one student had received credit for prior learning (clothing construction). The remaining students had no desire to receive credit for their prior learning.
7. Students learned about the ALE program from their friends and co-workers or by WCC advisors and faculty.

Appendix B contains a summary of the data obtained from the interviews.

Student Evaluation

Evaluations were obtained from twenty-seven students completing learning contracts that were initiated during Fall Quarter, 1978. Students met initially with ALE staff, other faculty or a community resource person to design their contract. Once their contract was designed, students met periodically with a resource person or faculty member to complete it. Students estimated that they spent an average of two hours with ALE staff during their learning contract experience. Estimates of time spent with a faculty member or a community resource person ranged from three to one-hundred-fifty hours with an average of twenty-one hours.

Responses received from the students related to their learning contract experiences indicated a very high level of satisfaction overall. Figure 1 lists each item and gives the mean rating and range for it.

FIGURE I

STUDENTS RATINGS* OF LEARNING

CONTRACT EXPERIENCE

ITEM:	MEAN RATING	RANGE
I was informed about how my Learning Contract fits within my degree program and/or educational goals.	4.4	1-5
I was informed of the steps to take to design and complete my Learning Contract.	4.7	3-5
I was allowed to design Learning Objectives that reflected my interests.	4.8	3-5
I was allowed to design Learning Activities that reflected my interests.	4.7	3-5
I was allowed to provide suggestions on the evaluation procedure of the Learning Contract.	4.8	2-5
I was provided sufficient learning resources (i.e. books, tapes, people, etc.) from the College.	4.5	1-5
I was provided sufficient assistance by the faculty or community resource person to complete my Learning Contract.	4.7	3-5
The Individual Learning Program provided a valuable learning experience.	4.8	3-5

* Five point rating scale. Low=1, High=5

Written comments made by students verified the high ratings of the questionnaire items. Examples of such comments made are:

1. Alternative learning is always a breath of fresh air to me. Hope it grows larger.
2. If not for contracts I would never have had the opportunity to learn.
3. Valuable. Great asset for future. Hope they keep the system.
4. Gained a lotof experience.
5. Gained much knowledge.

In summary, students felt they did well with their learning contract and had a valuable learning experience that was personally satisfying.

Appendix C provides detailed results of student evaluations.

Faculty Evaluation

Twenty out of the twenty-six faculty involved with learning contracts Fall Quarter, 1978, completed the instrument sent to them. Faculty indicated that they spent an average of 11.2 hours meeting with their students. Estimates of the amount of time spent ranged from one to thirty-three hours.

Initial involvement of faculty with students was spent in creating the learning contract. Only five indicated that their first meeting was spent in revising or refining a learning contract. Learning contracts, for the most part, were individually developed for each student. However, one comment made by a faculty member indicated that an existing contract used successfully in the past was employed.

Only one faculty member did not feel that he/she had been given sufficient assistance from ALE staff. The individual felt that he/she needed a more thorough explanation of the contract process as related to student contact hours, degree of supervision required and rate of remuneration for that supervision. The remainder of the faculty were apparently satisfied with ALE staff assistance.

Faculty overall responded positively about their learning contracts. When asked if their learning contract was relevant to the student's educational goal, the faculty unanimously responded yes. All of the faculty felt that the learning activities and evaluation procedures in the learning contract were appropriate. Seventeen faculty also felt that the learning contract required college level learning. The three faculty who did not, clarified their responses. One indicated that the learning contract was for high school credit. Another stated that it was difficult to determine because the learning contract dealt with affective learning. The third faculty member commented that the actual class material was college level, but the paper required in the contract and developing the learning contract itself "takes basic writing and organizational skills".

Ratings of faculty regarding student completion of learning contracts were high. The average of the ratings was 4.75 on a five point scale. Only three faculty rated student completion of their contract as "poor". One low rating was given

because the student had not yet completed the contract.

Ratings of faculty again were high regarding how valuable the learning experiences were for students. The average of the ratings was 4.75 (on a five point scale). Only one faculty member gave a "poor" rating and again that was due to the student not completing his/her contract.

Faculty were positive about their experiences with student learning contracts. Some comments made by individual faculty members were:

1. Allows student to direct learning which is a valuable experience and a skill in the "real world".
2. Provided excellent oportunity to work on an intimate basis with student and observe reactions and response to subject matter.
3. Gives students a chance to explore community resources. Student able to get special supervision and instruction.
4. One or two students can gain experiences in places to which a whole class could not have access.

Faculty suggested a variety of improvements for the ALE program. A sampling of suggestions is given below:

1. Needs to be a screening process. Not all students are ready to work outside a structured situation.
2. More communication between faculty and College concerning available resources.
3. Make this option known to more students.
4. Need clearer specifications of standards (expectations, more realistic compensation).

In summary, faculty evaluations of the learning contract activity within the ALE program were very positive. Faculty felt that the students' learning was valuable, relevant, and that students were engaging in college level learning. Their comments indicated a supportive attitude of the ALE program. Detailed results of the faculty evaluation is provided in Appendix D.

Program Costs

ALE program costs for Fall Quarter totaled $13,457. Specific expenditures attributed to Fall Quarter ALE activities were:

1.	ALE staff (1.5 FTE)	8,708
2.	Faculty/resource people	2,671
3.	Supplies and materials	357
4.	Travel	224
5.	Equipment	93
6.	Benefits	1,404

Calculations of program costs were, for the most part, based upon actual expenditures. In certain instances one third of the budgeted items, which were for program related activities, were included. These items were:

1.	Membership in CAEL	$\frac{350}{3} = 117$
2.	Travel	$\frac{672}{3} = 224$
3.	Office equipment	$\frac{280}{3} = 93$
4.	Benefits	$\frac{4211}{3} = 1,404$

Initial analysis of ALE program costs compared with FTE's produced shows a cost per FTE of $330.64 ($13,457 divided by 40.7 FTE's) for Fall Quarter, 1978.

Based upon staff estimates of the amount of effort expended on ALE activities Fall Quarter, costs per ALE activity were calculated. These costs are given in Figure 2. The method used to calculate these costs is found in Appendix F.

FIGURE 2

COSTS PER ALE ACTIVITY

Activity	% Effort	Cost	FTE'S Produced
1. Learning Contract	33	4,441	22.1
2. Associate degree program development (LISAF)	18	2,422	17.4
3. Assessment of Prior Learning	13	1,749	1.2
4. Cooperative Education	9	1,211	0
5. ALE staff training	7	942	0
6. Advising students	7	942	0
7. Administration of program	7	942	0
8. Multi-occupational programs	3	404	0
9. Credit by examination and correspondence schools	2	269	0
TOTALS	100	$13,457	40.7

Note that only three of the ten ALE activities produced FTE's Fall Quarter. Thirty-six percent of the costs of the ALE program ($4,845 of $13,457) funded a variety of ALE activities and represented thirty-six percent of ALE staff effort.

Also note that thirty-three percent of staff effort was expended developing learning contracts. Historically, however, learning contracts have required fifty percent of ALE staff effort and have accounted for approximately ninety-five percent of the FTE production. For Fall Quarter the percent of production for learning contracts was only fifty-four percent and accounted for only thirty-three percent of staff effort. This change was directly attributed to the Lummi Indian School of Aquaculture and Fisheries (LISAF) associate degree program development activity engaged in by the half-time staff person added Fall Quarter, 1978.

Further analysis was conducted to determine the amount of deviation from the initial FTE's cost calculation of 330.64. The half-time staff person's salary and associate benefits were removed from the budget total to approximate historically, ALE program costs.

Reducing the Fall Quarter total by the amount representing the half-time ALE staff person involved in program development yielded a total cost of $10,037 for the ALE program. The cost per FTE was calculated to be $430.77, $100.14 per FTE higher than the initial calculation of $330.63. However, considering that only fifty percent of that person's effort produced 22.1 FTE's from learning contracts and twenty percent more effort produced 1.2 FTE's, the net cost per FTE was $339.84. The difference of $90.93 per FTE (21%) represents essentially the "overhead" for the ALE program.

Note that the cost per FTE for the learning contract activity was $294.38. Further, during Fall Quarter, fifty percent of the ALE staff person's effort produced 22.1 FTE's compared to the average full-time faculty equivalent of 20.9 FTE's.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ALE program provided a variety of services to approximately one hundred and twenty-five students Fall Quarter, 1978. One hundred students were directly engaged in instructional activities through ALE during that period. The three activities which contributed to FTE production for the ALE program were learning contracts, LISAF program development and assessment of prior learning. The primary FTE producing activity was the development of learning contracts for students.

Both faculty and student evaluation's indicated that learning contract activities were valuable and relevant for the students engaging in them. Students expressed high satisfaction with their learning contract experiences and faculty verified that the learning activities engaged in were college level learning and that students did well completing their contracts (the completion rate of learning contracts developed Fall Quarter was eighty-eight percent over a two-quarter time perior). Both faculty and student comments indicated a very favorable attitude toward and support for the ALE program.

Cost of the ALE program for Fall Quarter, 1978, was $13,457. Cost per FTE was $330.63. Adjustments made in the budget to more closely reflect the ALE program prior to Fall Quarter, 1978, yielded an FTE cost of $430.77. The net cost per FTE was $339.84. The cost per FTE for just learning contracts was $294.38 and represented only fifty percent of a full-time staff person's effort. The FTE production yielded from the development of learning contracts for students was more than the average full-time faculty equivalent of 20.9 FTE's for Fall Quarter.

Based upon the results of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. ALE activities should be expanded at Whatcom. The costs are relatively low for the variety of options available to students.
2. Development of learning contracts for students be greatly expanded at Whatcom. The costs are very low, yet the instructional experiences are reated as very effective by both students and staff.
3. A systematic recordkeeping process be developed for the ALE program. Much of the "recordkeeping" is kept within the heads of the ALE staff.
4. Some of the ALE staff effort be focused toward monitoring learning contracts developed for students to ensure a standard for quality control of student learning outcomes. Currently, faculty provide the only quality control of student learning and that varies with each instructor.

5. ALE staff assume more liaison activity between student and faculty resource person to ensure learning outcomes and learning activities are clearly stated in the learning contracts. In many cases learning contracts were brief and did not clearly communicate what learning was going to occur.
6. The calculation of FTE's for Assessment of Prior Learning activity be examined. The current method requires twenty percent of a staff member's effort, yet yields a very insignificant number of FTE's. *
7. Expand the multi-occupation activity in the ALE program. The current expenditure of ALE staff effort (3%) is not sufficient to make the activity productive.
8. Expand the Cooperative Education, course challenge, correspondence school, and credit by examination options currently available to students. These as well do not receive sufficient attention by ALE staff to be productive activities.
9. Cost-effectiveness studies be conducted of other program areas at Whatcom so that cost-effectiveness comparisons between programs can be made.

The ALE program currently appears to be relatively efficient and very effective. If the above recommendations are realized, however, more students will benefit from improved ALE activities and better information can be obtained to more accurately determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the ALE program in comparison to other programs at Whatcom.

* FTE calculation for Assessment of Prior Learning has been revised Winter, 1979. Current caluculation - 10 credits per student.

APPENDIX A

Residence	
Bellingham	66%
Lummi Island	4%
Ferndale	9%
Lynden	7%
Seattle	2%
Sedro Woolley	2%
Blaine	5%
Custer	2%
Mt. Vernon	2%

Age		
18-25	(15)	29%
26-35	(26)	50%
36-45	(5)	10%
46-55	(5)	10%
82	(1)	3%

$\bar{X}$=31.73
R=19-82

Sex	
Male	48%
Female	52%

Educational Intent	
B	50%
F	19%
C	2%
X	4%
L	9%
D	4%
J	13%

Grade Point Average		
2.00 - 2.49	(6)	12%
2.50 - 2.99	(8)	16%
3.00 - 3.49	(16)	32%
3.50 - 4.00	(19)	38%
*	(6)	no G.P.A.

$\bar{X}$=3.20
R=2.00-4.00

Credits Earned		
0 - 15	(17)	30%
16 - 30	(17)	30%
31 - 45	(7)	13%
46 - 60	(4)	9%
61 - 75	(3)	6%
76	(7)	13%

$\bar{X}$=33.65
R=0-110

APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL LEARNING PROGRAM

4. Have you previously attended Whatcom?

Yes - (19)

No - (3)

When:
- past 2 years (3)
- Fall '78 (5)
- past 6 months (1)
- past year (3)
- last several years (2)
- Spring '78 (2)
- Winter '78 (1)

Credits earned:
- 12 (3)
- 13 (1)
- 20 (1)
- 70 (1)
- 78 (1)

Program enrolled in:
- AA (5)
- Non-degree (3)
- Paramedic (2)
- Multi-occupational (3)
- Fire Tech. (1)
- Tayloring & Design (1)

5. What is your educational goal?

AA (4)

AA then BA (1)

Develop skills & personal development (1)

BA & then MA in psych. (2)

AA or training to work in textiles (1)

undecided (2) - (want personal growth & variety of learning at this point)

Paramedic Certificate (1)

AA & BA & eventually library degree (1)

Fire Tech degree (1)

Graphic Arts (1)

Multi-occupational in natural healings (1)

BA in Sociology (1)

Multi-occupational in cabinet and furniture making (1)

AA then BA in psych. (1)

6. What specifically do you want to do now?

Contract in Indian Language, Intermediate Jewelry

Contract in Printing and bass guitar and audio engineering

Contract in graphic design and mime

Contract in alternative healing

Contract in alcohol and drug abuse

Contract in juvenile problems and delinquency

Contract in textiles

Contract in children's books and elementary school libraries

Contract in intro. to learning resources

Contract in alternative health

Contract in flat pattern design III, costume design and fashion design (1)

Contract in crisis counseling

Contract in intro. to woods and tools for wood

Contract for training as a paramedic

Contract in animation

12 credit contract to work on while in Alaska

Learn more art

Finish last 12 fire tech. courses to graduate

Finish last credits to graduate (elective credits)

Contract in perspective drawing and one in graphic arts production

Develop program plus 12 credits of contract including massage, polarity, tsien Sen Do and reflexology.

7. Have you ever developed and completed a Learning Contract?

Yes - (15) No (4)

a) If yes, describe:

- what (subject area, credits earned)

about 20 credits - human services
Indian language
Intermediate jewelry
12 credits printing, music, graphic arts
35-40 credits in drama, communication, printing
Psych. of afterlife
5 credits in legal aspects of juvenile court
Quilting and applique
3 credits in LRC
Paramedic courses (2)
About 8 credits in tayloring and design
Nutrition, organic gardening
Interpersonal communications
English 104
Cooperative experience plus Fire Tech. course
Karate - 3 credits
15 credits drawing & graphic arts
4 credits in colonic irrigation

- when

Past year (2)
Past year and a half (1)
Fall 1978 (8)
Winter 1978 (2)
2 years ago (1)
Spring 1978 (1)

- where

Whatcom Community College (10)
" " " & Happy Valley Elementary School (1)

Appendix B (con't)

7.

b) If no, why do you want to develop one now?

- time constraints? (2)
- location constraints? (1)
- unavailability of instruction? (20)
- wants one-on-one work with faculty. (1)

8. Have you ever received college credit for things you have done previously?

a) If yes, describe - In clothing construction (1)

b) (If no, interviewer describes process available for that person)

If no, would you like to receive college credits for your prior learning?

No - (21)

9. Have you earned any college credit for your prior learning?

No - (19)

Yes - (1) - where: WCC
WWU

10. How did you learn about ALE?

Friend at work (1)

Financial Aid (3)

Friend (4)

Advisor (2)

Bill Edes in LRC (1)

Pat Berwick (1)

Terry Brainard (2)

Gary Hedberg (Fire Dept.) (2)

John Bell (Dir. of Crisis Ctr.) (1)

Referred by CETA (1)

From Jim Dodd (1)

From ALE coordinator (1)

Another student (1)

Person canceling a Fire Tech. course (1)

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Interview Guide
Individual Learning Program

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Phone _____
4. Have you previously attended Whatcom?
   -when?
   -credits earned?
   -program enrolled in?
5. What is your Educational Goal?

6. What specifically do you want to do now?

7. Have you ever developed and completed a Learning Contract?
   a) If yes, describe:
      -what (subject area, credits earned)
      -when
      -where
   b) If no, why do you want to develop one now?
      -time constraints?
      -location constraints?
      -unavailability of instruction?
8. Have you ever received college credit for things you have done previously?
   a) If yes, describe
   b) (If no, interviewer describe process available for that person)
      If no, would you like to receive college credit for your prior learning?
9. Have you earned any college credits that you want to transfer to Whatcom?
   -When?
   -Where?
   -Number of credits earned?
10. How did you learn about ALE?

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INDIVIDUAL LEARNING PROGRAM STUDENT EVALUATION

N = 27

Course _____ Date _____

Please respond to each item below. The information you give will be of value in evaluating and improving the Individual Learning Program.

1. The person that helped me design my Learning Contract was _____.
2. The faculty or community resource person who helped me complete my Learning Contract was _____
3. I spent $\bar{X}$=2 (range=0-23) hours with the program facilitator Susan Mancuso and/or Nate Smothers.
4. I spent $\bar{X}$=21 (range=3-50) hours with the faculty or community resource person.

Please rate items 5-12 as to the degree you believe it has been satisfied for you.

		$\bar{X}$	R
5.	I was informed about how my Learning Contract fits within my degree program and/or educational goals / 20 / 2 / 3 / / 2 / HIGH LOW	4.4	1-5
6.	I was informed of the steps to take to design and complete my Learning Contract. / 22 / 2 / 3 / / / HIGH LOW	4.7	3-5
7.	I was allowed to design Learning Objectives that reflected my interests. / 23 / 2 / 2 / / / HIGH LOW	4.8	3-5
8.	I was allowed to design Learning Activities that reflected my interests. / 23 / 1 / 3 / / / HIGH LOW	4.7	3-5
9.	I was allowed to provide suggestions on the evaluation procefure of the Learning Contract / 22 / 3 / 1 /1 / / HIGH LOW	4.8	2-5
10.	I was provided sufficient learning resources (i.e. books, tapes, people, etc.) from the College. / 21 / 2 / 2 / 1/ 1 / HIGH LOW	4.5	1-5
11.	I was provided sufficient assistance by the faculty or community resource person to complete my Learning Contract. / 20 / 5 / 2 / / / HIGH LOW	4.7	3-5
12.	The Individual Learning Program provided a valuable learning experience. / 21 / 4 / 1 / / / HIGH LOW	4.8	3-5

13. Describe how well you feel you did in completing your Learning Contract.

14. Please describe positive aspects of the Individual Learning Program.

15. Please describe suggestions for improving the Individual Learning Program.

16. Please make any additional comments. If more space is needed use back of form.

CLASS:

Paramedic Training (2)

Quilting Applique and Patchwork (1)

Sociology 189 (2)

Intro. Library Science (1)

Paramedic 189 (1)

Lyric Writing (1)

Business Communication (1)

City Planning (1)

Naturopathic Nursing (1)

English course (1)

Political Science course (1)

1. Who designed contract?

Ron Gustafson (1)

Bill Edes (1)

Peggy Olafson (1)

Gerald Pressler (1)

Clarence Zylstra (1)

Chris Dickenson (1)

Susan Mancuso (7)

2. Who helped complete contract?

Sue Webber (1)
Ron Gustafson (1)
Dan Ohms (B.F.D.) (2)
Pat Berwick (1)
Barbara Smith (1)
Phil Roorda (1)
Mrs. Lee Brown (1)
Bill Edes (1)
Peggy Olafson (2)
Pat Sikes (1)
Sue Mancuso(2)
Joseph Wessels, M.D. (1)
Clarence Zylstra (1)
Myself (1)

APPENDIX C
ILP - Student Evaluation

3. Hours spent with Program Facilitator?

2 hrs. (3)

1 or 2 hrs. (1)

1 hr. (3)

many (1)

1? (1)

0.5 hrs. (1)

8 hrs. (1)

4. Hours spend with faculty or community Resource person

many - (1)

150 hrs. (1)

23 hrs. (1)

8-12 (not clear) (2)

10 hrs. (1)

20-25 hrs. (1)

2.0 hrs. (1)

20 hrs. (2)

1 hr. per wk. (1)

15 hrs. outside of class (1)

none (1)

13. Success with Program

did well (3)

not complete yet (1)

fulfilled what I wanted to learn (1)

learned how to maintain my learning contract (1)

very interesting - highly motivating (1)

completed all objectives (1)

gained alot of experience (1)

satisfactory (1)

pretty good (1)

very well (3)

Eng. 101 not good course (1)
for ILP - too easy
Poli. Sci. too difficult

14. Positive Aspects of I.L.P.

Good teachers (1)

Gave students opportunity to express themselves (1)

Good reading material and information (1)

If not for the contract, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to learn (2)

Designed to fit individual needs (1)

Can work at your own speed (3)

Can create own learning environment (1)

Discipline self to attain set goal (1)

Offers unlimited curriculum (1)

Contract can reflect your own interests (4)

Self-motivation - individual work (1)

Taught me how to work hard and feel good when I gained my goal (1)

Provided opportunity to work in library (Happy Valley) (1)

Great experience! (1)

Would rather be taught in a classroom (1)

Builds personal resourcefulness (1)

Flexible (1)

Creative and challenging (1)

Confidence building (1)

No pressure, work at own speed. Helps to set a goal. Good program. (1)

Flexibility to do what I wanted with Sue's incredible support and evergy. (1)

Fewer problems with scheduling, cancellation, etc. (1)

Able to move at own pace, learn what I wanted to learn from someone actively involved in vocation you are studying. (1)

Faculty member very cooperative (Susan M.). Was perfect administrative person. Did her job very well. (1)

14. (con't)

Chris Dickinson was very good teacher. Able to take classes not offered by College. (1)

Fits better with individual's schedule. (1)

Makes student assume responsibility for learning instead of teacher. (1)

15. Suggestions for Improving Program:

Program set-up well. (1)

No complaints. (1)

Compile a list of resources available in various areas of study. (1)

Form a committee involved with program to encourage and support and counsel persons interested but hesitant to commit themselves to a contract. (1)

No suggestions. Ran smoothly. (1)

Greater variety of resources and help finding them. (1)

Perhaps provide prospective student with sample learning objectives for each course of interest. (1)

Should promote I.L.P. more to students. (2)

Make sure that resource person knows what is required and expected of him/her. (1)

Should begin to plan I.L.P. before quarter begins. Faculty should complete course outlines on time. (1)

More time alloted to spend with instructor. (1)

Tell more students about I.L.P. (1)

Grade instead of pass or fail. (1)

More demanding objectives to take to some of the resource people. (1)

16. Additional Comments:

Very valuable experience. (1)

Very progressive. (1)

Great opportunity. (1)

Really like it. Hopes to do more. (1)

I had total input in designing contract. (1)

APPENDIX C
I.L.P. - Student Evaluation

16. (con't)

Enjoyed this new experience and learned much. (1)

Susan Mancuso and Peggy Olafson are two most efficient people on W.C.C. staff. A pleasure to work with them. (1)

Individual interest and counseling from Susan M. is what makes this type of program work. Her interest and help is greatly appreciated by students. (2)

Feel this is a good program. Aided me a great deal with my academic program. (1)

Good for students who don't have enough time for other programs due to conflicting schedules. (1)

Alternative learning is always a breath of fresh air to me. Hope it grows larger. (1)

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INDIVIDUAL LEARNING PROGRAM FACULTY EVALUATION - APPENDIX D N = 20

Course _____ Date _____

Please respond to each statement below. The information you give will be used to evaluate and improve the Individual Learning Program.

1. Approximately how many hours did you spend meeting with the student about his/her learning contract? 11.2 hours. (See Attached)

2. When you first met with the student, were you involved in (check one): See Attachment
   5 revising/refining the student/s learning contract?
   13 creating the learning contract with the student?

3. Were you provided enough assistance from Sue Mancuso and/or Nate Smothers?
   18 yes 1 no

   If no, what assistance did you need?
   More thorough explanation of contract process: Student Contract Hours
   Degree of Supervision
   Rate of Rumuneration for Supervision

4. Do you feel the learning contract was relevant to the student's education goals?
   20 yes _____ no If no, why?

5. Do you feel the learning contract required college level learning? 17 yes 3 no

   If no, why? Difficult to determine because it was effective
   It was for high school credit
   Not the actual class material, but paper and developing L.C. takes basic writing and organizational skills. (con't. - see attachment)

6. Do you feel the learning activities in the learning contract were appropriate?
   20 yes _____ no

   if no, why? Must be super specific about activities and deadlines or student fails

7. Do you feel the evaluation procedures incorporated in the learning contract were appropriate?
   20 yes _____ no If no, why?
   Very Thorough!

8. How well do you think the student did in completing his/her learning contract?

   5 / 5 / 3 / 4 / / 1 / 2 / $\bar{X}$ = 4.75
   WELL POOR

9. How valuable of a learning experience was provided this student with this learning contract?

   5 / 5 / 6 / 1 / / / 1 / $\bar{X}$ = 4.75
   Valuable Not Valuable

APPENDIX D
Faculty Evaluation - ILP

10. Please describe positive aspects of the Individual Learning Program.

(See Attachment)

11. Please make suggestions for improving the Individual Learning Program.

(See Attachment)

12. Please make additional comments. If more space is needed, use back of form.

(See Attachment)

W.C.C./L.S. 12/5/78

ILP - Faculty Evaluation
Attachment to Questionnaire - Appendix D

1. Hours spent with student:

1	hr.	(1)	10	hrs.	(1)
3	hrs.	(1)	10-12	"	(1)
4	"	(1)	15	"	(4)
3-5	"	(1)	19	"	(1)
7	"	(1)	33	"	(1)
7½	"	(1)	12	"	(1)
8	"	(1)			

2. What was involved on first encounter with student?

The contracts were already written and had been used successfully in the past.

Initially I requested that the student write her ideas and see me again.

5. Did Learning Contract require college level learning?

Only in the sense of accepting responsibility for learning, self-motivation and commitment. Some high school students can do that.

Hard to tell. Some information isn't offered elsewhere. Other is definitely college level.

10. Positive aspects of I.L.P.

P.E. (Yoga class) - Initiative and responsibility for student's learning was significatn. Her objectives benefitted her physically and emotionally.

On the spot appraisal of work.

Positive reinforcement for improvement and imaginative originality.

Allows student to direct learning, which is a valuable experience and a skill in the "real world".

Allows student to express academic interests.

Provided excellent opportunity to work on intimate basis with student and observe reactions and response to subject matter.

Requires a motivated student. Knowledge acquired is comparable to a regular class when occasional contacts are made with instructor.

Allows student to learn individually and has a tendency to go beyond his requirements.

Students benefitted from their work. It proved helpful experience.

ILP - Faculty Evaluation
Attachment to Questionnaire (con't)

10. (con't.)

Required self-study and initiative on part of student. Personal experience relayed. Ongoing communication with other medics used. Doctors opinions used. Other Fire Dept. procedures and protocol used.

Solves problems for students trying to obtain necessary credits and important training they otherwise couldn't get.

As a support faculty, it provided an opportunity to work in instruction. Provides faculty opportunity to promote learning. Provided student with classes not taught in classroom environment.

Gives student a chance to explore community resources. Student able to get special supervision and instruction.

Learning skills relevant and applicable to students goals. One-to-one working ratio allows more attention and feedback.

One or two students can gain experiences in places to which a whole class could not have access.

Allows for individuality, maturity, self-paced learning, plus self-discipline.

Can tailor content to maximize relevance. Progress at individualized rate.

Flexibility, student studies in areas of interest and can work at own pace.

11. Suggestions for improvement:

I was adversely affected by the Dean's suggestion that I should do Learning Contracts for "free".

Needs to be a screening process. Not all students are ready to work outside a structured situation. I would like to discuss this point further with Susan.

More communication needed between faculty and College concerning available resources.

Not for all students. Must be a self-starter.

More time needed for program. Quarter went by too quickly. Continuation of advisory information for students needed.

ILP Faculty Evaluation
Attachment to Questionnaire (con't.)

11. (con't)

Make this option known to more students.

Meet with students more frequently instead of once a week for an extended time.

Need clearer specifications of standards (expectations, more realistic compensation).

For students who need more guidance along the way "packaging" is resourceful.

12. Additional Comments

Enjoyed working with students who took on large tasks for themselves and made great progress. Hope to get more students like these on Learning Contracts.

Felt that student should write contract, although some students don't know what they need to learn and what activities are appropriate. Feels his position as faculty member mey have inhibited students when writing Learning Contract.

Found experience rewarding, hope to be able to participate again. Will a brochure be prepared welcoming new faculty and explaining the ILP and the faculty's role in the contract?

Contract learning varies from student to student. Some require much more instructor contact than others.

This program is a definite plus for W.C.C.

Gives students a taste of the "real" world.

Susan is soing a great job!

Basically an excellent approach.

APPENDIX E

FTE'S COST CALCULATION

Fall Quarter, 1978, production of the full-time ALE staff person was 23.3 FTE'S. Twenty-two point one FTE'S were produced via learning contracts. Subtracting salary and benefits for the half-time ALE staff person from the ALE budget for Fall Quarter reduced the total of $13,457 by 3,420, leaving $10,037 for ALE program costs with one full-time staff person. This calculation of cost per FTE'S ($10,037 divided by 23.3 FTE'S) yielded $430.77 for Fall Quarter, 1978.

However, considering seventy percent of the staff person's effort was expended to produce the FTE'S, the net cost was $339.84 per FTE ($10,037 - @,119 = $7,918 divided by 23.3 = $339,84. The 42,119 represented 30% of the salary and benefits for the ALE staff person). Calculation of the cost per FTE'S for learning contracts was derived by reducing the total of $10,037 by $3,531, the amount represented 50% of salary and benefits for the ALE staff person. The calculation was $10,037 - $3,531 = $6505.70 divided by 22.1 = $294.38.

ALE ACTIVITY COST CALCULATION

Percent of effort per ALE activity was estimated by ALE staff. Costs per activity were calculated by multiplying the total cost of the ALE program Fall Quarter, 1978, by the percentages obtained for each ALE activity. The cost for the learning contract activity was derived as follows:

$$\$13,457 \times .33 = \$4,441$$

All other activity costs were derived in the same manner.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
OCT 12 1979
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES